

# **WAM**

# ***Watershed Assessment Model***

***Final Report (Phase 1)***

***by***

***Janice Traynor, R.P.F.***

Prepared for:

***Foothills Model Forest***

and

***MDFP Research Trust Fund***

***August 1997***

***Calgary, Alberta***

## ***Disclaimer***

The project/study on which this report is based was funded by the Foothills Model Forest under the Partners in Sustainable Development of Forests initiative delivered by the Canadian Forest Service of Natural Resources Canada.

The views, statements and conclusions expressed and the recommendations made in this report are entirely those of the author and should not be construed as the statements or conclusions of, or as expressing the opinions of, Foothills Model Forest.

also,

The study on which this report is based was funded by the Manning Diversified Forest Products Research Trust Fund, which is a component of the Government of Alberta's Environmental Protection and Enhancement Fund. The views, statements and conclusions expressed and the recommendations made in this report are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be construed as the statements, conclusions, or opinions of members of the Manning Diversified Forest Products Research Trust Fund Committee, the Government of Alberta, or the Alberta Forest Research Advisory Council.

## ***Foothills Model Forest Mission***

"to develop and recommend an approach to sustainability and integrated resource management through research and technology developed by means of collaborative partnerships".

## ***Relationship between Foothills Model Forest and Resource Management Agencies***

The Foothills Model Forest represents a broad range of stakeholder groups with interest in Alberta's forests and how they are managed. However, Foothills Model Forest has no resource management authority or responsibility. The authority over, and responsibility for, the management of Alberta's public lands is vested in the Government of Alberta. The Government delegates certain rights and responsibilities to various resource industries and organizations which conduct their activities on public lands in Alberta. The Government of Alberta and other agencies and organizations will consider and respond to the recommendations of Foothills Model Forest from the perspective of their particular rights, responsibilities, obligations and stewardship commitments.

# ***Abstract***

The Foothills Model Forest Watershed Assessment Model (WAM), provides information on watersheds, their characteristics and resources. WAM presents an integrated approach using the results of computer models, GIS, and resource inventory data together with an interactive viewing interface. WAM output results provide basin, hydrology and resource inventory information generated by ArcInfo analyses and hydrology models for selected points or watersheds in the project area. Additional point information, such as inventory results from external databases can be linked to these results. This is the final project report and outlines WAM, the information generated by analyses, data issues and processing requirements. Details are given of the steps involved in preparing DEM data, using ArcInfo hydrologic analysis tools, calculating watershed characteristics and generating a stream network. Samples of the output datasets viewed through ArcView are shown and results compared to information generated manually from topographic maps.

The use of watershed information in planning and the value of topography information generated by GIS are outlined. The results of testing WAM on two diverse landscapes are presented and the strengths and limitations of the stream network generation functions discussed. Recommendations for additional testing and opportunities for users to provide input are given.

# Executive Summary

The Foothills Model Forest Watershed Assessment Model (WAM), provides information on watersheds, their characteristics and resources. WAM presents an integrated approach using the results of computer models, GIS, and resource inventory data together with an interactive viewing interface. The purpose of the project was to develop a planning tool and provide resource information to managers to better evaluate land management alternatives for effects on hydrology, aquatic habitats and fish.

In January of 1994 Foothills Model Forest invited hydrologists, fish biologists and foresters familiar with the hydrologic and fish resources of the Foothills Model Forest to a workshop. In their proceedings of this workshop Rothwell and O'Neil (1994) outline a strategic plan which states that WAM should provide: landscape information for hydrologic and aquatic resource evaluation; information to describe regional and local hydrologic regimens and responses to forest harvesting in terms of annual yield and peak flow events; and information on key fish species and aquatic habitats.

Physical properties such as slope, aspect, location and bedrock morphology combine with vegetation cover, climate and land use to make each watershed unique. GIS allows watershed characteristics to be calculated quickly and accurately however the results are dependent upon the quality of the spatial data. In the WAM application, a digital elevation model (DEM) presents a 3-D model of the surface of the watershed and is the starting point for hydrologic analysis. WAM uses hydrologic analysis tools within the GRID module of ArcInfo to predict watershed characteristics such as upstream drainage area, basin area, elevation, and also stream order, profile, gradient, length and sinuosity. WAM can also calculate the density for a variety of linear features such as stream, roads or seismic lines.

WAM incorporates the results from two separate FMF watershed projects to generate hydrologic information. The equations from the regional hydrologic study (Hydroconsult 1997) provide a simple means to estimate existing or baseline streamflow and the WRNSFMF model (R.H. Swanson & Associates 1997) simulates annual yield and peak flow changes and is useful in estimating cumulative effects on streamflow of sequential harvests through time.

The WAM process can be summarized in 7 steps:

1. **Select a project area.** This is the geographic area of interest and must include the entire basin, including headwaters surrounding any points of interest.
2. **Generate an elevation grid.** WAM utilizes ArcInfo hydrologic functions in the GRID module to generate a hydrologically correct elevation grid.
3. **Input or generate a corrected stream network.** A corrected streams network is a requirement of WAM. This is a network in which all arcs are connected, correspond to the direction of stream flow, have a unique identifier and an attribute of stream order. If a corrected streams network is unavailable WAM can build one from DEM data.
4. **Build a stream order route system.** A route allows multiple, connected arcs to be stored as a single linear feature. This is necessary to measure distances along streams.
5. **Calculate plot attributes.** Link the point to a location on the closest stream. Calculate stream lengths, sinuosity, stream gradient, stream profiles, generate drainage and basin boundaries, calculate areas and estimate streamflow.
6. **Calculate feature density.** A variety of point and line densities can be calculated for stream basins. Options include stream, seismic line or road densities and number of stream crossing or inventory sites (provided a point coverage of locations exists).
7. **Generate WRNSFMF dataset.** A database file is generated in a format that can be input directly to the WRNSFMF model to evaluate annual yield changes from forest harvesting.

Test results are presented for the Upper McLeod Watershed within the Foothills Model Forest and the Red Earth Creek Watershed in northern Alberta. WAM was able to create a stream network from DEM data and this closely resembled the interpreted streams network for the Upper McLeod watershed. The Red Earth Creek watershed is very flat and WAM could not generate a stream network in this terrain. The results of WAM were compared to calculated stream characteristics for the Tri-Creeks basin. In general the information provided by WAM closely resembled that calculated manually from topographic maps. Additional evaluation and testing of WAM output results for the Foothills Model Forest is recommended.

Generating watershed characteristics from the GIS is much more efficient than calculating them manually from an air photo or map however, these estimates are only as good as the data used to generate them. The user must consider the accuracy of the selected DEM and apply the results at an appropriate scale. Research demonstrates that analysis using a DEM can provide valid information on slope, drainage areas, drainage networks and other topological information.

Stream order is a mechanical classification. It is important to identify the characteristics of the data used to define the stream network and to understand the characteristics of a defined first-order stream if comparisons are to be made with stream order values from other sources.

WAM requires ArcInfo including TIN and GRID add-on modules on a Unix workstation and ArcView 3.0 on either the PC or workstation to run. The ideal configuration is a PC running ArcView linked to the Unix server running ArcInfo. The WAM analysis can also be run independently and the data exported to the user running ArcView on a stand-alone PC. WAM requires considerable system resources and is most efficiently run on an area less than 1000 km<sup>2</sup>.

It is recommended that WAM analyses be completed on a large project area within the FMF. The results of these analyses should be provided to users interested in evaluating WAM. A mechanism to receive feedback and suggestions for improvements in WAM from these users should be implemented.

# ***Acknowledgments***

The success of the Watershed Program at Foothills Model Forest was due to the strong support of a wide range of sponsors and contributors. I would like to thank those attending the original FMF watershed workshop who developed a clear, concise strategic plan, which provided direction for the program and focus for development of a Watershed Assessment Model. Implementation of this plan was made easier by the strong support of staff of the FMF major sponsors, especially Alberta Environmental Protection. I would like specially to thank Carl Hunt, Natural Resources Service, Fish and Wildlife Division and John Taggart, Water Sciences Branch, Hydrology Section for their commitment to the concept and continued support from the original workshop, through the establishment of the FMF watershed program to the receipt of final deliverables. The development of WAM could not have proceeded without the expertise, advice and hard work of The Forestry Corp GIS staff, in particular Christian Weik, Carol Doering and Brian Maier.

WAM is the final product of the FMF Watershed Program (Phase 1) and incorporates the results of separate hydrology and fisheries projects. Those involved in these related projects provided expertise, comments and direction for WAM development. In particular, I thank Dr. Bob Swanson, consulting forest hydrologist, Craig Johnson, FMF fish ecologist and Gord Stenhouse, Weldwood wildlife biologist for their input. This program would not have been possible without funding from a wide variety of sponsors. Foothills Model Forest covered staff and administration costs throughout the program and core funding for most projects. The Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service provided funds for WAM development through the Decision Support System Initiative. Manning Diversified Forest Products Research Trust Fund also provided multi-year support for this project.

<b>Disclaimer</b>	<b><i>i</i></b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b><i>ii</i></b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b><i>iii</i></b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b><i>v</i></b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
1.1 What is WAM?.....	1
1.2 History of FMF Watershed Program .....	1
1.3 Objectives .....	2
1.4 Related Projects.....	2
<b>2. Methods</b>	<b><i>3</i></b>
2.1 Overview .....	3
2.2 Concept development .....	3
2.3 Selecting components of WAM.....	3
2.3.1 Watershed characteristics .....	4
2.3.2 Hydrology estimates.....	5
2.3.3 Fish and aquatic habitat information .....	5
2.4 Testing of WAM.....	5
2.4.1 Develop streams layer from existing data.....	5
2.4.2 Spatial information .....	6
2.4.3 External databases .....	6
2.4.4 WAM runs.....	6
2.5 Workshops.....	7
2.6 Deliverables.....	7
<b>3. Results</b>	<b><i>8</i></b>
3.1 WAM GIS Application.....	8
3.1.1 Data requirements .....	8
3.1.2 Process .....	8
3.1.3 Output datasets .....	9
3.1.4 Viewing results.....	9
3.2 Examples .....	9
3.2.1 Use of these data .....	11
3.3 WAM Test runs .....	11
3.3.1 Upper McLeod Watershed .....	11
3.3.2 Red Earth Creek Watershed .....	12

<b>4. Discussion</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Watershed Information in Planning .....	14
4.2 Watershed characteristics from the GIS .....	14
4.2.1 DEM.....	14
4.2.2 Stream Order .....	15
4.3 Data Issues.....	15
4.4 Model and System requirements.....	15
4.4.1 Application development .....	15
4.4.2 Results testing .....	16
<b>5. Recommendations</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6. Project Summary</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7. Literature Cited</b>	<b>20</b>



# ***1. Introduction***

This report will document the development of WAM, the Foothills Model Forest (FMF) Watershed Assessment Model during Phase 1 of the model forest program (1994-1997). The reader will be shown a brief history of the project, the links to other projects in the FMF Watershed Program, watershed concepts addressed within WAM, the specific components of the WAM framework and results of WAM analyses. The report will also present the results of testing of WAM on two different watersheds located with the Upper Foothills and Northwest Boreal forest regions of Alberta. Discussions of the strengths and limitations of WAM and recommendations for further development of the WAM framework are included.

The User Manual and System Guides for WAM are published as separate, related documents (The Forestry Corp (TFC) 1997ab). The reader is directed to these documents for more detailed descriptions of WAM and computing and data requirements to run WAM.

## ***1.1 What is WAM?***

WAM provides information on watersheds, their characteristics and resources. WAM presents an integrated approach using the results of computer models, GIS, and resource inventory data together with an interactive viewing interface. Loucks (1995) defines a DSS as an interactive computer-based information provider which provides timely information to support decision makers. Under this simple definition WAM is a decision support system developed in the Watershed Program (Phase 1) of the Foothills Model Forest, Hinton Alberta. The WAM application runs on an Unix workstation running ArcInfo GIS software and results are viewed using ArcView 3.0 desk-top GIS software. The user selects a project area, which encloses the watershed(s) of interest for WAM analysis. WAM output results provide basin, hydrology and resource inventory information generated by ArcInfo analyses and hydrology models for selected points or watersheds in the project area. Additional information for these points, such as inventory results stored in a database format, can also be integrated. These results can then be viewed as maps, tables, graphs or point attributes on-screen or output to printer or file. The user can access the full capabilities of ArcView, including spatial analysis and queries to evaluate the results.

## ***1.2 History of FMF Watershed Program***

The Foothills Model Forest program began in 1992. The original proposal outlined initiatives to integrate forest management with watershed and aquatic ecosystem management. In particular the need to characterize aquatic ecosystems and their variability and to understand watershed responses to forest harvesting and the natural variability of streamflow were identified. Shortfalls in program funding meant that the start of the watershed program was deferred. While fiscal realities were understood staff and partners of Foothills Model Forest continued to lobby for a program which focused on the aquatic portion of the forest ecosystem.

In January of 1994 Foothills Model Forest invited hydrologists, fish biologists and foresters familiar with the hydrologic and fish resources of the Foothills Model Forest to a workshop. Participants were asked to investigate the feasibility of and develop a strategic plan for the development of a Watershed Assessment Model. In their proceedings of this workshop (Rothwell and O'Neil 1994) outlined a strategic plan for developing a watershed assessment model (WAM). The FMF Watershed Program was established in August of 1994 to implement this plan and continued until the end of Phase 1 of the model forest program, March, 1997. WAM is the final project in this program.

## ***1.3 Objectives***

The purpose of the “Development of Watershed Assessment Model (WAM)” project was to develop a planning tool and provide resource information to managers to better evaluate land management alternatives for effects on hydrology, aquatic habitats and fish. The original objectives, contained in the strategic plan (Rothwell and O’Neil 1994) can be summarized as:

1. Develop a spatial model, which provides information on watershed, hydrology, aquatic habitat and fish resources for use by resource managers.
2. Incorporate existing and developing resource information and models to better characterize these resources.
3. Construct an open, transparent application framework, which is modular in nature and incorporates local data specific to the region of interest.

The FMF work plan (December 1994) for this project listed the desired end result as:

“A system capable of evaluating a harvest plan for the resulting cumulative effects of forest management activities on the quantity and quality of water yield from a given watershed or complex of watersheds, and in turn be able to evaluate the impact of the harvest plan on the quantity and quality of aquatic and fisheries habitat. By simulating the outcome of different land management alternatives in time and space, both negative and positive impacts of land disturbances can be identified and incorporated into management decisions. The primary goal of WAM is to assist managers in maintaining the integrity of aquatic ecosystems and associated hydrologic values, as a prerequisite for the support of viable, stable fish populations.”

These comprehensive objectives guided the program and individual project development. At this stage in development WAM has met the objectives however all the outlined end results have not been achieved. WAM provides information on the quantity of water yield but assumes application of best management practices will address the issue of water quality. Information to describe aquatic habitat is generated by WAM however a means to measure the quantity and quality of fish habitat is not available. Achieving the end results will require testing and use of WAM in management decision-making. Some desired results, particularly evaluating quantity of aquatic and fisheries habitat is known to be difficult and may be impossible to measure. All results of WAM should be evaluated within a decision framework which reflects the specific goals, policies, management practices, local resource knowledge and expert opinion of the user and the organization they work for.

## **1.4 Related Projects**

WAM is linked to other FMF watershed projects in a variety of ways. The equations from the Regional Hydrology Study (Hydroconsult 1997) are programmed directly into WAM to provide streamflow estimates. An output of the WAM analysis is a table of information (.dbf format) which can be used as the input dataset to the WRNSFMF model (R.H. Swanson & Associates 1997) to evaluate annual yield and peak flow effects of a forest harvest plan. The locations of fish and stream inventory sites are stored on the GIS and can be used as input points for WAM analyses. Additional site attributes calculated by WAM include stream gradient, stream order, basin areas, road density and distance from source. When viewing the output of WAM in ArcView, specific site information stored in external databases are joined with the results of WAM analyses to provide a comprehensive listing of available information for each point.

The flexibility of WAM allows a variety of external databases or spatial data to be incorporated. The previous examples all contain information specific to the Foothills Model Forest region. If WAM is to be used in other regions it is important that the broader applicability of these project results be assessed and local data used where possible.

# 2. Methods

## 2.1 Overview

The development of WAM was an evolving process. The WAM approach is unique, the knowledge base is growing and new tools, GIS capabilities and opportunities continue to arise. Thus there should be little surprise that the project encountered some dead-ends, roadblocks and a few curves. At this point the development of the WAM application is complete and ready for site installation and testing by users. The results of this application testing and comparison of results from WAM to those calculated manually or through other means should be used in evaluation of this project. WAM should continue to be viewed as a work-in-progress allowing it to benefit from and respond to user comments when, in the future it is used in an operational setting after installation on the FMF GIS system.

## 2.2 Concept development

The Strategic Plan for Development of a Watershed Assessment Model (WAM) (Rothwell and O'Neil 1994) provided direction for this project but not specific tasks. Literature reviews and discussions with resource professionals did not identify any previous research or tools which could be used as a prototype for development of WAM. The project benefited from a study of existing approaches to watershed analysis in use in the U.S. Pacific Northwest. The following documents (and telephone discussions with authors or users of these methods) were useful, especially in the early stages of WAM development:

- Standard Methodology for Conducting Watershed Analysis (Washington Forest Practices Board 1994)
- A Federal Agency Guide for Pilot Watershed Analysis (FEMAT 1994)
- Timber-Fish-Wildlife Ambient Monitoring Program Manual (D. Schuett-Hames *et al* 1994).

GIS was a necessary foundation for WAM not only to access and analyze spatial data but also to manage the large amounts and varied sources of data available for the landbase. ArcInfo and ArcView were in use at Foothills Model Forest and had inherent analysis, data management and data viewing capabilities, which were used in WAM. The components of WAM were chosen in response to the information requirements of the hydrologic models and the planning process.

In the past a number of significant watershed research programs have taken place within the Foothills Model Forest Region. Swanson and Hillman (1977) verified that water yield increased after forest harvesting. Results from Tri-Creeks experimental watershed program provided information on fish and hydrology in the region. In his summary of Tri-Creeks research results, Nip (1991) identified that point sources such as stream crossings and access roads crossing ephemeral draws and source areas were the main contributors of sediment entering stream channels. Rothwell (1978) provided watershed management guidelines for logging and road construction to minimize detrimental effects on water quality. These results helped establish priorities for development of individual components of WAM.

Most water quality concerns can be minimized through application of known, best management practices, especially for road and stream crossing construction. WAM provides information on topography to support planning decisions for road networks and stream crossing locations but does not include predictive equations for water quality. Equations to predict streamflow and the effects of forest harvesting on hydrology are important components of WAM.

## 2.3 Selecting components of WAM

The strategic plan (Rothwell and O'Neil 1994) states that WAM should provide:

- landscape information for hydrologic and aquatic resource evaluation,

- information to describe regional and local hydrologic regimens and responses to forest harvesting in terms of annual yield and peak flow events and
- information on key fish species and aquatic habitats.

Time and funding constraints dictate that, wherever possible existing information should be used. Hay and Knapp (1996) summarize the characteristics of the data required to investigate natural, potential, and human-induced impacts in a watershed as: (1) The data have both a spatial and temporal dimension; (2) there is a vast amount of data at multiple scales and formats; and (3) the data must be understood by a broad range of people with differing levels of scientific background. WAM is designed to address all three of these points. The following sections outline how and what types of information are generated within WAM.

### 2.3.1 Watershed characteristics

Watershed characterization identifies the physical properties that influence a watershed's hydrologic properties including water quality and the magnitude of streamflow. Physical properties such as slope, aspect, location and bedrock morphology combine with vegetation cover, climate and land use to make each watershed unique. Most of these data are available in a digital form however such datasets are usually large, complex and stored in a variety of formats. GIS is an ideal tool for watershed characterization. It allows one to measure watershed characteristics faster and more accurately (Civco *et al* 1995) however the accuracy is dependent on the spatial data's quality.

The digital elevation model (DEM) provides a three-dimensional representation of the basin. Each point has three coordinates. The X and Y coordinates identify the geographical or spatial location on the landscape and the Z coordinate provides elevation. In the WAM application, DEM data (points with elevations) are converted to an elevation grid (each cell has a single value for each coordinate). The spacing of these cells within the grid is specified by the user. The DEM models the surface of a watershed and is the starting point for hydrologic analysis.

There is a set of hydrologic analysis tools within the GRID module of ArcInfo. WAM uses these functions to predict many of the watershed characteristics. Using a digital elevation model as input the potential for surface flow is modeled and the following information calculated:

- the location of the watershed boundary (height of land) and the area enclosed in this polygon. In WAM two terms are used, **upstream drainage area** is the area that drains to a specific point located on a stream and **basin** is the area that drains to the location downstream of that specified point where the stream order changes.
- **elevation** of a point
- **stream order** for each section of the stream. A first order stream has no tributaries, a second order stream has two or more first order tributaries, a third order stream has two or more second order tributaries and so on. Stream order is an attribute of the corrected streams network.
- **stream profile** is calculated within a buffer (generally 500 m up and down stream) around the site and also from the stream source to the mouth. In WAM the mouth of the stream is the point downstream of the site where stream order increases. This table of values can be graphed in ArcView to view the profile.
- **stream gradient** within the buffer is calculated as a percentage, change in elevation (upstream to downstream) over length of the buffer.

ArcInfo routes based on stream order are used to identify the path to the source and mouth of the stream. From these routes, **stream length**, the distance from the site upstream to the source and downstream to the mouth is calculated. This distance is divided by the straight-line distance to calculate **sinuosity**. The upstream drainage area and area within specific elevation classes are used with equations from the regional hydrologic analysis (Hydroconsult 1997) to provide estimates of peak flow, flood volume and average monthly flows at the point. WAM also calculates the density for a variety of features depending on GIS data available. For line features such as stream, roads or seismic line the total length within the basin is calculated. For point features such as inventory sites or road-stream crossing sites (where locations are stored as points on GIS) the number of sites per area is calculated.

In a separate calculation WAM can prepare a database file which can be input directly into WRNSFMF (Swanson & Associates 1997) and used in an evaluation of annual and peak flow response to harvesting. This

calculation requires additional information on vegetation cover (species and height), forest harvest plans, and cut history. The reader should reference the WAM User Guide and System guides (TFC 1997ab) for more detailed information.

### **2.3.2 Hydrology estimates**

WAM incorporates the results from two FMF watershed projects to generate hydrologic information on:

- **streamflow.** Hydroconsult (1997) prepared the Hydrologic Operational Manual from the results of a regional hydrology study completed in the Foothills Model Forest. This study performed a detailed hydrologic analysis on the data available from long-term streamflow monitoring undertaken by Water Survey of Canada. The resulting equations provide a simple means to estimate existing or baseline streamflow on any stream in the Foothills Model Forest. These equations are developed for streams in the area around Hinton. After evaluating local data they may be found to be useful for planning purposes in areas of the foothills north or south of FMF however when using WAM in other regions the results of a local regional hydrologic analyses should be used.
- **annual yield.** R.H. Swanson & Associates (1997) developed the WRNSFMF model and the WRNSFMF User's Manual to help evaluate the effect of forest harvesting on streamflow. The size, distribution, location, and vegetation of clearings in a watershed influences snow distribution (snow accumulation in clearings is greater than under a forest canopy) and consequently the amount of water available for runoff. WRNSFMF builds upon the WRENS hydrologic procedure developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, adding the results of watershed research in Alberta and customizing the model for the FMF region. WRNSFMF simulates annual yield change using seasonal precipitation, forest harvest information and growth curves for basal area and height and is useful in estimating cumulative effects of sequential harvests through time.

The reader can reference these documents for more detailed information.

### **2.3.3 Fish and aquatic habitat information**

FMF initiated a comprehensive literature review of habitat requirements for native sportfish species found in the region. R.L.& L. Environmental Services Ltd. (1996) completed An Information Review of Four Native Sportfish Species in West-Central Alberta. This report provides information on the habitat requirements of various life stages of the target species and potential effect of land use activities however the results did not identify specifics which could be programmed into WAM. Similar to the other components of WAM the knowledge base of fish and aquatic habitat information is continually expanding. The Fisheries staff at Foothills Model Forest is currently studying relationships between fish presence or abundance and habitat or watershed features.

WAM incorporates the results of recent and historical fish and stream inventories when questions relating to fish are evaluated. Site locations are stored as points in a spatial coverage and used to run WAM. Inventory results are stored in a relational database linked through a common site identity. When viewing results the external databases are linked to the point attribute results table from WAM analysis. This allows all site information to be available in a single table and viewed within ArcView. The attribute table can also be exported to supply watershed information to the inventory results database.

## **2.4 Testing of WAM**

### **2.4.1 Develop streams layer from existing data**

A corrected streams network is a requirement of WAM. This is a network in which all arcs are connected, correspond to the direction of stream flow, have a unique identifier and an attribute of stream order. At this time few organizations have a corrected streams network. Midway through the project the decision to develop a corrected streams network for all of Foothills Model Forest was changed to developing a network

for a smaller pilot study area in the Upper McLeod watershed. FMF staff and consultants identified four tasks to upgrade the GIS streams data.

1. Connect arcs from the provincial base layer and replace representations of double-line rivers and lakes with single lines to form a stream network.
2. Ensure the direction of all arcs corresponded to the direction of flow.
3. Identify named stream routes and assign a unique number to each of these streams. The single route for a named stream contains all the arcs from the source (the longest first order stream) to mouth (where the stream flows into another named stream). For unnamed streams, routes contain a set of arcs from the first order source stream to the mouth where the streams flow into a named streams. The stream name of Unnamed is assigned to each of these routes along with a unique number. This unique stream number allows unnamed streams to be differentiated.
4. Assign stream order attributes. Calculate stream order for each section of stream and input this information as an attribute of the streams network. This task was not completed manually due to time and funding limitations. Two GIS application tools that assign stream order to a corrected network were identified however the time to test these tools was not available.

Test runs of WAM components used the DEM to generate a corrected stream network. The User and System guides (TFC 1997ab) provide detailed descriptions of the steps involved in generating a stream network and elevation information.

### ***2.4.2 Spatial information***

WAM requires DEM data to run and much information is generated from this one data source. The additional information required for specific WAM components include vegetation cover, forest harvest history, and forest harvest plans. Road and seismic coverages can be used in density calculations. This information was available for the Foothills Model Forest from Weldwood of Canada, Hinton Division, a major sponsor of FMF. Fish and stream inventory and road-stream crossing inventory site locations were also available as a point coverage. Daishowa Marubeni International Ltd. provided data for Red Earth Creek.

### ***2.4.3 External databases***

WAM can utilize a wide variety of external databases. The user can best identify what external data to include relative to the questions being asked. Test runs included inventory results for the FMF Fish and Stream Inventory project results for 1995 and 1996, historical fisheries inventory results from Alberta Fish and Wildlife, and for demonstration purposes only, the results of a road-stream crossing inventory completed by Weldwood. The only requirement is that a common, unique identifier links the external database to a point or polygon location on a spatial coverage.

### ***2.4.4 WAM runs***

The Upper McLeod watershed was used as the development area for WAM. This watershed includes the Tri-Creeks Experimental watershed area and is located south of Hinton, Alberta. The headwaters form in the watershed divide on the border of Jasper National Park. This is a typical foothills stream system and the topography is quite variable. GIS data, hydrologic models and inventory results were available to test all components of WAM.

Near the end of development WAM was tested on a completely different watershed, Red Earth Creek in northern Alberta. This region has very little relief and the stream density is very low. Fewer data are available for this area. Daishowa Marubeni International (DMI) provided DEM, vegetation cover, uncorrected streams information, historical cut and harvest plan data. Streamflow calculations used equations from a regional hydrologic analysis completed on the Peace River by the Water Sciences Branch, Alberta Environmental Protection. Water yield calculations used WRNSDMI, a related model to WRNSFMF which is customized for the hydrologic conditions in the northern boreal forest.

## **2.5 Workshops**

Two workshops to introduce WAM took place in April, 1997. The workshops were led by GIS staff of the Forestry Corp, the developers of WAM application and Janice Traynor, former Watershed Coordinator of the Foothills Model Forest who directed the project. The first workshop in Hinton presented WAM to an audience of resource professionals (fisheries, forestry, parks and wildlife) from across Alberta. The second, held in Manning presented WAM to an audience of forestry and water resources professionals working in northern Alberta.

## **2.6 Deliverables**

Three documents are available as deliverables for this project. In addition to this report the User and System guides (TFC 1997ab) outline the specifics of model use, data needs and system requirements. The WAM GIS application is also available however this is not an application that can be packaged and distributed independent of technical support. Contact Foothills Model Forest for additional information on these deliverables.

# 3. Results

The major results associated with this project are the WAM GIS application and the output datasets generated by WAM. In this section an overview of the WAM application is presented. The reader is directed to the WAM User Guide and System guides for more detailed information. The results generated by WAM will depend upon the questions asked, the project area location, the data available and the analyses selected. As an introduction to the datasets produced by WAM some examples and potential uses are shown. Finally results of test runs on two types of landbases, the Tri-Creeks area near Hinton, and Red Earth Creek in northern Alberta are presented.

## 3.1 WAM GIS Application

The WAM application is unique in terms of the approach taken to extract watershed information from a spatial database and is consequently complex. The WAM application is written to run on the UNIX workstation with ArcInfo software. The ArcInfo TIN and GRID add-on modules are required. ArcView 3.0 is used as the user interface to view the results. The full capabilities of ArcView can be used to evaluate the results from WAM.

### 3.1.1 Data requirements

A digital elevation model (DEM) is the foundation for many of the WAM calculations. During WAM tests the Alberta Provincial DEM (50 metre resolution) was used. WAM also requires an input point coverage to initiate attribute and density calculations. These points may represent existing inventory site locations or indicate locations of interest such as a potential road/stream crossing locations. To create the WRNSFMF dataset forest cover, harvest plans and historical harvest information is required. These data must adhere to rigid input formats and structures as outlined in the User Guide.

### 3.1.2 Process

The WAM process can be summarized in 7 steps:

1. **Select a project area.** This is the geographic area of interest and must include the entire basin, including headwaters surrounding any points of interest. Each WAM run is called a project and assigned a unique name by the user.
2. **Generate an elevation grid.** WAM utilizes ArcInfo hydrologic functions in the GRID module to generate a hydrologically correct elevation grid. Default grid cell size is 25 metres. If a larger cell size is chosen (i.e. 100 metres) processing speed is increased however the resolution of the data is lower.
3. **Input or generate a corrected stream network.** If a corrected streams network is unavailable WAM can build one from DEM data. This generated stream network is dependent on the accuracy of the DEM and reflects the DEM data resolution, terrain variability and grid cell size. Stream order attributes are calculated for the network.
4. **Build a stream order route system.** A route allows multiple, connected arcs to be stored as a single linear feature. This is necessary to measure distances along streams. Routes are calculated for each section of stream based on stream order and from the point upstream to the source and downstream to the mouth of the stream.
5. **Calculate plot attributes.** Link the point to a location on the closest stream. Calculate stream lengths, sinuosity, stream gradient, stream profiles, generate drainage and basin boundaries, calculate areas and estimate streamflow.
6. **Calculate feature density.** A variety of point and line densities can be calculated for stream basins. Options include stream, seismic line, road or stream crossing densities.
7. **Generate WRNSFMF dataset.** A database file is generated in a format that can be input directly to the WRNSFMF model to evaluate annual yield changes from forest harvesting.



### **3.1.3 Output datasets**


WAM generates 12 output datasets for each project. Polygon coverages are created for elevation (50 metre elevation classes), aspect (north, south, east or west), and basins (upstream drainage areas and basins). The corrected streams coverage is a line coverage coded by stream order. Info tables present stream profile results for the buffer and the stream and streamflow estimates for flood volumes, peak flows and monthly flows. WAM\_PLOTS is a points coverage generated from the input point locations. Attached to each point are the calculated plot attributes and feature density results.

### **3.1.4 Viewing results**

All output datasets from WAM can be viewed within an ArcView project. ArcView provides a visual representation of information and relationships in a comprehensive, fairly easily learned software package. Additional data can be linked to the output datasets by joining theme attribute tables to external databases containing inventory results.


Data can be presented in a variety of ways within ArcView: A view can map plot locations on streams; a table presents specific data on that plot location; a chart graphs relationships and scripts can automate common procedures. Views organize spatial data as theme layers, the building blocks of the project. A view is useful for looking at information by features, using the identify tool and a point and click interface. Data can also be viewed within tables. Theme tables present attributes of the spatial features. External databases (e.g. inventory data, model results) can be attached to these theme tables using a common plot number. Charts graph table information in a variety of formats. Layouts provide the template to produce reports and hard copies of the results. ArcView allows a wide range of viewing and reporting options for WAM. The reader can access all the capabilities of ArcView and customize this to best address their information needs and reporting requirements. It is likely that these will be different for each user or organization and for each question.

## **3.2 Examples**



**Figure 1.**

This is a grey-shade representation of DEM data. Lower elevations are darker and the pattern of streams is evident.



**Figure 2.**


A View of basins and stream network generated by WAM for part of the Tri-Creeks area.

Note the small basin in the center of the figure. This plot has been snapped to the incorrect stream and consequently plot attribute data is incorrect. This plot should be copied to a location closer to the main stream and the WAM analysis repeated for this plot.

Tables of information for the selected plot are shown below.

<b>Plot Attributes Calculated by WAM</b>	
FMF Fish Inventory Plot	96157
Stream Order	4
Elevation of Point (m)	1346
Stream Length from Source (m)	2284
Sinuosity of Stream Length	1.3
Length of buffer (m)	1000
Sinuosity within Buffer	1.1
Stream Gradient at Point	2.4
Basin Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	416653120
Upstream Drainage Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	10288125

<b>Information from attached database</b>	
FMF Fish Inventory #	96157
Stream Name	DEERLICK CREEK
Sample Date	Sept. 9, 1996
Mean Stream Depth	0.1
Mean Wetted Width	2.0
Number of Fish	150.0
Fish Species Codes	RNTR



**Figure 3.**

Stream profile, site 96157.

Note that the profile seems to go slightly uphill at some points. This is an anomaly introduced during the conversion of a raster to a vector structure. See WAM User Guide (TFC 1997b) for additional information.

### **3.2.1 Use of these data**

The use of information is linked to the question being asked, assumptions inherent in input data and characteristics of the region. It will reflect the perspective and expertise of the user. This information generated by WAM should be evaluated within a decision framework built upon scientific knowledge, research results, best management practices and expert opinion appropriate to the decisions to be made and the region and organization where WAM is being used..

A WAM run using an input point data coverage of fish and stream inventory sites could be used in a variety of ways. The point attributes calculated for each sample site includes some information such as stream order, elevation and stream length which in past studies has been calculated from 1:50,000 NTS topological maps. This information is generated much more efficiently through WAM. An investigation of relationships between fish presence or abundance and watershed features might use information on watershed characteristics generated by WAM. In ArcView streams could be coded according to the species which have been found there, for instance all streams with bull trout could be shown in red. Specific management practices may be identified for these streams.

An input points coverage could be generated which indicates potential locations for road-stream crossings. WAM datasets generated from these points will be useful in planning and evaluating these crossing locations. Streamflow estimates provide information on the peak streamflow and flood volumes at the site. Stream profile, gradient and sinuosity information provides some broad site characteristics for the preliminary steps in planning. Fisheries information may indicate the type of crossing (bridge or culvert) to install. Species present in the inventory will help to define the in-stream-operating window for construction. The density of existing roads and crossings is important information to help define cumulative effects of new development.

Completing a WAM run for a basin designated for harvest will provide resource information for a forest planner. Harvest plans can be evaluated for effects on annual yield and peak flows using WRNSFMF. Fish inventory results for the streams in the basin identify species present and historical inventory results can help to characterize populations. Seismic, road and crossing densities provide information on existing development and may help to quantify the impact of additional development.

## **3.3 WAM Test runs**

### **3.3.1 Upper McLeod Watershed**

Numerous test runs within the Upper McLeod watershed were completed during development. Project areas ranged from a small watershed 1 to 2 km<sup>2</sup> to a final run for a project area covering nearly 6 UTM mapsheets (13 ATS Townships) or 1200 km<sup>2</sup>. The most recent dataset represents almost 60 inventory sites and covered over 1000 km<sup>2</sup>. The results of testing are summarized in three sections, stream network generation, input data and output datasets.

#### ***Stream network generation***

In the absence of a corrected stream layer a stream network was generated by the DEM and compared to the streams coverage based on 1:20000 interpreted base data. The stream network generated by WAM reflects the accuracy of the DEM, the grid cell size and flow accumulation tolerance selected. Different cell sizes and flow accumulation tolerances were tested. A 25 m grid cell size and flow accumulation tolerance of 100 were found to produce the network which best emulated the interpreted data (based on a visual evaluation). In general, these stream networks were very similar at a planning scale (1:15000). The generated streams network had a higher stream density than the interpreted data. This is a function of the value chosen for flow accumulation tolerance, which determines stream density. The generated network had more 1<sup>st</sup> order stream segments although interpreted 1<sup>st</sup> order stream segments were generally longer than the generated streams (again a function of flow accumulation tolerance). It is likely that on the ground many of these additional generated 1<sup>st</sup> order streams might be classed as ephemeral draws or intermittent streams and contain streamflow at some point during the year.

In our testing, the generated network was found to model the stream network in this area well and is appropriate to use to generate information to support basin level planning. Before using a generated stream

network the user should compare this with other available streams data. Such comparisons should consider the accuracy of both the DEM data and the interpreted data, the resolution required for decision-making and the time and costs associated with generating the two types of stream networks. In the absence of a corrected streams network in this type of foothills terrain the generated streams network will be useful.

### ***Input data***

The Upper McLeod watershed is located in a region with many years of fish inventory and forest management. Spatial data are available for most of the landbase. A number of hydrologic research studies and long-term flow monitoring stations have been established in this region. The literature also contains information on this type of foothills stream, the fish resources and the aquatic habitat requirements. As part of the FMF Watershed program digital copies of much of this information were created. The only data unavailable for WAM was a corrected streams network. As mentioned previously the generated streams network worked well as a substitute.

### ***Output data***

A preliminary evaluation of the output datasets shows that point attribute results generally reflect expected values for this region. A comparison of WAM information for streams in Tri-Creeks (Eunice, Deerlick and Wampus creeks) with information calculated from 1:15000 topographical maps presented in Nip (1991) showed:

- Stream order at the mouth (confluence with the McLeod River) for generated streams were 4 and from the map were 3.
- Stream lengths for Eunice and Deerlick were within 10% of the map measurements. For Wampus Creek the generated stream measurement was 20% less. This difference is attributed to differences in first order source streams.
- Total basin area measurements differed by less than 3%.

Although the generated streams network is available care must be taken in its use due to the existence of spurious streams, generally small 1<sup>st</sup> order streams to which plots are incorrectly snapped to for analyses. In a test of 60 points over 10% of these were snapped to spurious 1<sup>st</sup> order streams. For these plots most calculated information is then incorrect. Fortunately these points are easily identified when the basins coverage is viewed.

Solutions to the problem of points snapping to incorrect streams include: generating a stream network which is less dense and consequently would have less spurious streams by adjusting flow accumulation tolerance; ensuring plots are associated with the appropriate stream when the points coverage is created (thereby ensuring calculations are performed on the proper stream); or rerunning the analyses with a coverage where points have been moved or copied closer to the proper stream. The availability of a permanent, corrected streams network would minimize this problem.

Basins for some points near the edge of the project area appear irregular. It is important the project area completely enclose the basins surrounding any points of interest. When the large area was selected, basins for a few points on the edge of the project area were delineated with a straight line on one side, indicating the project area did not cover the full basin. Results for these points will be discarded and WAM analysis repeated using an expanded project area.

### ***3.3.2 Red Earth Creek Watershed***

The Red Earth Creek is a very flat watershed in the northern boreal forest of Alberta. These data were provided for testing to evaluate WAM on a landbase completely different from the Upper McLeod watershed. Testing was completed on an area covering 4 UTM mapsheets, approximately 750 km<sup>2</sup>. The results are presented in terms of the streams network, input data and output data.

### ***Streams network generation***

A corrected streams network was not available for this region. Unfortunately WAM was unable to generate a stream network in this area of low relief using grid cell sizes up to 100 meters. In a flat landscape stream channel elevations are very close to those of the surrounding land and more difficult to define. The DEM resolution and accuracy were not sufficient to detect such small changes across the landscape and delineate a streams network. The results were not unexpected as the generated streams procedure was known to work best in regions with higher relief. Mackey *et al* (1994) applied the ANUDEM process (also used in WAM) in low relief areas of northern Ontario and was unsuccessful at 100m grid spacing. In low relief areas Mackey *et al* generated a connected streams network for the region from interpreted provincial base data. This streams network was then used to enhance the drainage enforcement algorithm in ANUDEM and help to identify streams and their associated valleys. Using a grid cell spacing of over 200 metres and extensive editing they were successful in generating topographic information.

WAM programming does not presently allow for additional streams input data when using the ANUDEM functions. If WAM is to be used in low relief areas additional programming and testing are needed. (See WAM User Guide (TFC 1997b) for additional discussion).

### ***Input data***

There are fewer resource data available for forests in northern Alberta and little information is stored in a digital form. For Red Earth Creek DEM data, vegetation cover, harvest history and harvest plans were available to produce the WRNS output dataset. The WRNSDMI annual yield model, customized for use in northern Alberta was used instead of WRNSFMF. A broad scale regional hydrology analysis provided predictive streamflow equations applicable to this area although the data to develop the equations were sparse.

### ***Output data***

WAM successfully developed the output dataset for input to WRNSDMI and evaluation of annual yield changes with forest harvesting. WAM was unable to generate a streams network or subsequent hydrologic analyses so basin size was calculated manually. In this region drainage basins cover a large area and spread across multiple map sheets.

# 4. Discussion

## 4.1 Watershed Information in Planning

The first objective of this project is to develop a model to provide information on watershed, hydrology, aquatic habitat and fish resources for use by resource managers. These resource values are interdependent. For example, watershed characteristics can influence fish directly through natural or introduced barriers to fish passage and also indirectly through forest harvesting influences on streamflow and aquatic habitat and consequently fish. This is only one of many relationships between these resources. This interdependence suggests that these resources should not be viewed in isolation and that planning should consider a wide range of watershed values. WAM provides information on this broad range of resource values however WAM does not make decisions. The manager makes the decision in response to the questions being asked and reflecting their own expertise.

WAM is based on the concept of watershed analysis, defined by Montgomery (1995) thus:

*“Watershed analysis provides a framework for delineating the spatial distribution and linkages between physical processes and biological communities in an appropriate physical context, the watershed ..... (It) provides information, knowledge and understanding necessary for scientific interpretation to support informed decision making, but it is not equivalent to making management decisions. Determining the activity appropriate for a watershed rests on weighing potential future conditions against planning objectives, legal mandates, and management constraints”*

WAM provides the information. Depending on the questions asked the land manager can then use this information to directly answer the question or to support a decision-making process where more complex questions are answered using an ecosystem approach to land management, considering the wide range and interrelationships of these data. Klock (1985) states that effective watershed management planning can reduce or eliminate many of the effects of land use practices in the forest ecosystem and the resulting impacts on site productivity and downstream aquatic ecosystems. Incorporating additional information at the front end of the planning process can help avoid crisis management. Management decisions are likely to be more defensible if potential impacts are realistically addressed based on current knowledge early in the planning process (Montgomery *et al* 1995).

Topography may be linked directly or indirectly to virtually every major ecosystem function across a landbase. WAM was developed to help address fish and hydrology concerns but the information on topography is more broadly applicable. Mackey *et al* (1994) outline local topography influences on site factors and the use of this information in the forest management planning process.

## 4.2 Watershed characteristics from the GIS

### 4.2.1 DEM

There is no question that generating watershed characteristics from the GIS is much more efficient than calculating them manually from an air photo or map. These estimates are only as good as the data used to generate them. One must recognize the accuracy of the selected DEM and apply the results at an appropriate scale. Research does, however, show that analysis using a DEM can provide valid information on slope, drainage areas, drainage networks and other topological information. Tribe (1991) found that “these techniques are faster and provide more precise and reproducible measurements than traditional manual techniques applied to topographic maps”. The U.S. Geological Survey conducted comparison tests on “primary drainage-basin characteristics” derived from the GIS and manual topographic map measurements. The results indicate no significant difference between the two measurements (Eash 1994). Other research suggests that slopes and aspects obtained from USGS DEMs have no significant error (Bolstad and Stow 1994 *in* Civco 1995). These studies emphasized that results are dependent upon the resolution of the DEM and that measurements improved as grid cell size decreased. Louck (1995) states that individuals learn from

trial and error experimentation and from performing sensitivity analyses. Being able to do this relatively quickly and interactively increases this learning experience. In addition to ease of use and timesavings a benefit of GIS generated information is the use of a standard operating procedure that can be duplicated. The results can be replicated and, if the DEM is the same resolution, comparisons between areas are appropriate.

### **4.2.2 Stream Order**

Stream order is a mechanical classification. The definition of first order streams reflects the smallest streams defined on the GIS or map used as the base for numbering. Where two first order streams meet a second order stream is formed. Likewise, where two second order streams converge is designated a third order stream. In headwater areas, first order stream segments normally change from perennial (one that flows continuously) to intermittent (a stream that is usually dry during part of each year) to ephemeral (which only flows in direct response to precipitation or snow melt) (Lee 1980). It is important that the users identify or specify characteristics or the source of those streams classified as first orders (i.e. where an intermittent stream becomes permanent). There is no overall standard "first-order stream attributes" however within a discipline standard conventions may exist. For example in Alberta fish biologists traditionally used 1:50,000 NTS maps as the standard. A first-order stream was the smallest stream shown on these maps and would represent a permanent stream as identified by a photo interpreter. WAM uses GIS data generated from a DEM or from provincial base data and differs from this 1:50,000 NTS standard. It is important to identify the characteristics of the data used to define the stream network and understand the characteristics of a defined first-order stream if comparisons are to be made with stream order values from other sources.

Another issue arises when a generated stream system is used. If the GIS identifies spurious streams and incorporates these into the streams network the stream order classification may change. The existence of a corrected streams layer from interpreted data will solve this potential problem. Until then the influence of spurious streams must be recognized.

## **4.3 Data Issues**

All information generated within WAM should be "value-neutral". It has been stated that management of natural resources such as fish, water and forests is both an art and science. The issues are complex and our understanding is incomplete. Adaptive management, which combines scientific research and knowledge with on-going evaluation of forest practices allows management decisions to evolve as new information becomes available. In this changing environment an information-generating model will be more useful in the long-term if it does not interpret the data. This also allows the information to be used to answer a wider range of questions from a more diverse group of users. It is important to recognize the assumptions inherent in each of the data sources for WAM.

During application development the components of WAM were tested to ensure that the results of analyses were those expected from the sample datasets. Additional testing and evaluation should be done to compare results of the WAM analyses to results generated manually or by other means. The results of WAM are dependent upon the quality of the input data and quality control tests of the output should be done both visually and through comparison of values. For the manager using WAM this results testing will help to generate confidence in the results, to develop a decision framework to use these results and indicate options for refinement of WAM.

## **4.4 Model and System requirements**

### **4.4.1 Application development**

The WAM application is unique and complex. Only during development did those involved come to understand how difficult development of the application would be. Many of the hydrologic functions in ArcInfo are new and few have been applied in a forest environment. The available documentation described tools to complete the tasks required within WAM however technical detail in this documentation lacking. Assumptions were made by the developer regarding the technical capabilities of ArcInfo and only at the testing phase were these found to be incorrect. Thus in planning these hydrologic tools were seen to be a perfect fit for WAM and only after testing were their limitations identified. One example is stream routes. In

testing it was recognized that there was no provision for routes to flow downstream, the same direction as the arcs. Rather the direction was determined from one corner of the map sheet with no regard to topography. This resulted in stream routes that flowed uphill and required considerable additional coding to correct. The solution devised allows WAM to perform the required calculations however these additional steps increase the computation time. Also each requirement for a unique solution required time to complete. Fortunately, using the full capabilities of GIS, a broad range of GIS expertise and some creative solutions WAM was completed. At present WAM is installed on the GIS at The Forestry Corp. Installation at the Foothills Model Forest will take place in the future when the GIS is installed in their new office.

WAM requires ArcInfo including TIN and GRID add-on modules on a Unix workstation and ArcView 3.0 on either the PC or workstation to run. The ideal configuration is a PC running ArcView networked to the Unix server running ArcInfo. In this configuration all the data can be stored on the server and with X-emulation the user can initiate the WAM analysis from their PC. The WAM analysis can also be run independently and the data exported to the user running ArcView on a stand-alone PC. In much of the testing of WAM data were transferred using email between the developers in two cities. This option would allow staff in field offices without a server to use the information from WAM in decision-making.

WAM requires considerable system resources and is most efficiently run on an area less than 1000 km<sup>2</sup>. Once the elevation grid and route systems for the area are calculated these steps do not have to be repeated for subsequent runs on the same area. It may be efficient to complete these steps once for project areas that cover the whole management region during low user load times (i.e. nights or weekends) and store in a common workspace. These data can then be used in future to complete any WAM analysis without the same need for system resources.

#### ***4.4.2 Results Testing***

The next step in the WAM project should be to compare the results generated by WAM with those calculated manually or through other means. Those looking to use WAM are best able to identify results from alternate sources for comparison. Two suggestions for results testing are a comparison of basin shape and size with Water Survey of Canada information and completing a corrected streams network for the Upper McLeod Watershed and comparing this to the generated streams network.

##### ***Comparing basins***

FMF received a GIS coverage of the location of Water Survey of Canada (WSC) hydrometric stations and the drainage basin for each station within the FMF. It is believed that these basins boundaries were digitized from manually delineated boundaries on 1:50 000 NTS maps. The points representing location of hydrometric stations can be used as input to WAM. The resulting basins boundaries and areas from WAM can then be compared with the polygons on the WSC GIS coverage.

##### ***Comparing stream networks***

During the development of WAM considerable time was spent working to develop a corrected streams network for the Upper McLeod Study Area however it was not completed. The remaining tasks are to assign stream order attributes to the network and generate stream routes. If these tasks were completed WAM analyses could be run using both the corrected streams network and the generated streams network for the entire Upper McLeod Watershed Study Area. The results testing can include both visual and statistical comparisons of the location and shape of stream networks and a comparison of the resulting WAM output datasets.

##### ***Comparing with manually methods***

WAM calculations for stream attributes such as sinuosity, gradient and stream profile can be compared with manually generated values for the same point. Common techniques for generating these values use 1:50 000 NTS mapsheets and a map wheel. The inherent limitations of data used in both calculations must be recognized.



# 5. Recommendations

The following recommendations are summarized from discussions and feedback among those involved in the project, FMF staff and workshop participants. A common thread in the comments received is that evaluation is difficult because WAM is not yet complete. Those interested in the project want a chance to use WAM, to review the results of WAM for an area they are familiar with, and to then have an opportunity to provide useful criticism and influence the final product. The time required for developing WAM, lack of GIS facilities at FMF and concurrent changes in FMF staff and programs meant that the end date for the project was reached before WAM was fully tested and operational. It is hoped these recommendations will provide future direction for FMF as they evaluate opportunities for implementation of WAM.

## ***Install WAM on FMF GIS and generate WAM datasets for full FMF area.***

The current version of WAM is best characterized as a “beta” or testing version. It can benefit from the comments and feedback of users once WAM is installed on the FMF GIS and used in an operational context. It is important that staff of the Foothills Model Forest and sponsors receive the results of WAM analysis for the Foothills Model Forest, not just a small pilot area. If this cannot be completed on the FMF GIS system due to limitations in staffing, system capabilities or technical expertise, the analysis should be completed elsewhere and the data provided to FMF. This will ensure that the output datasets can be evaluated and results accepted or rejected by potential users.

## ***Complete results testing***

It is important that the user compare information generated by WAM to similar information generated manually from maps or through other means. The results of these comparisons will help instill confidence in the use of these outputs and also indicate the appropriate scale and situations to use this information. This results testing should reflect the ways WAM information is to be used. Section 4.4.2 suggests some results testing to be completed.

## ***Implement a mechanism to receive feedback and suggestions for improvements in WAM.***

An application feedback mechanism should be put in place by FMF. The GIS administrator could implement this. When people are using the application on a regular basis they should have an opportunity to suggest improvements. WAM represents a new, unique application and there is bound to be room for minor improvements in response to user feedback.

## ***Initiate workshops or discussions with potential users***

Potential users of WAM have not had an opportunity to test WAM nor to become confident in the validity of the results generated by WAM. Workshop or discussions between users and the developers of WAM would be useful. A comparison of watershed information for a broad area generated by standard methods (such as manual calculation of basin characteristics from NTS maps) to those generated by WAM would provide information to support these discussions. A technical report outlining the capabilities of WAM and the results of testing could be prepared for distribution.

## ***Investigate the cost and delivery time for acquiring corrected streams data.***

Although the Province of Alberta corrected streams data is to be completed in the next two years, there are agencies that are currently capable of building this network in a short period of time. A corrected streams coverage is needed if WAM is to be used in flat terrain as the results to date are not acceptable. A corrected streams network from interpreted data would also help to address the problems of spurious streams and points snapping to incorrect arcs. Stream order attributes should be assigned and routes generated for the partially completed streams network in the Upper McLeod Study Area.

### ***Complete further testing of WAM on moderate and low relief basins.***

The applicability of the stream generation functions in WAM to areas outside of FMF has not yet been demonstrated. The application should be tested on basins of moderate and low relief and the results of this testing used to update this part of the WAM application. A generated streams network is available for the entire FMF region.

### ***Adjust WAM application to take full advantage of the corrected streams data.***

When a corrected streams network is available, the effectiveness of functions within WAM should be tested and evaluated to ensure the output results using the interpreted network are correct. For example, when the application builds basins from a point directly on the new streams, if the stream does not correspond exactly with the depression in the DEM the resulting basins could be incorrect. The potential to improve the results of the ANUDEM functions by using a corrected streams network should also be explored.

### ***Use information generated by WAM to help investigate the issue of fish and fish habitat in land-use planning.***

This is a complex issue with many components to be evaluated. FMF is currently researching these questions. The information generated by WAM could be used to support this investigation.

### ***Drop the reference to model in the WAM name.***

The WAM application presents the results of models but does not model any system. There is confusion with use of the term Watershed Assessment Model that might be alleviated with a new title. This fact must be balanced with the existing name recognition for the term WAM. FMF may wish to identify a better title for this application or use the simple title WAM with additional description.

## 6. Project Summary

The development of the WAM application was completed during Phase 1 of the Foothills Model Forest program however the testing, evaluation, refinement and operational use of WAM remain to be completed. The following table and comments are provided to document the current status of WAM and provide direction to FMF staff and partners as they evaluate and plot the direction of this WAM project during Phase 2 of the FMF program.

Issue	Comments
Results testing incomplete	<p>The results of WAM need to be compared to existing data and alternate methods for calculating watershed information. Users of WAM with different expertise and information requirements should evaluate results and compare these with the information currently being used.</p> <p>This testing will provide information to support the decision to use WAM in management decision-making</p>
Confidence in the digital representation of watershed	<p>As with any model the results are dependent upon the quality of input data. The DEM is a keystone of all WAM processing. The user must recognize the resolution of the selected DEM. They must also be aware of the resolution and inherent limitations of current information sources i.e. maps, manual measurements and field truthing.</p>
Availability of a corrected streams layer	<p>Streams are integral to WAM analyses. Unfortunately, existing Alberta digitized base data does not contain a corrected streams network. WAM can generate a streams network however this is dependent on DEM data resolution, terrain variability, and grid cell size.</p>
Quality of stream channel measurements on generated stream networks	<p>Values for sinuosity reflect the type of line representation of the stream. Generated streams result from raster processing and consequently have a “blocky” outline. Results testing is needed to compare sinuosity values for a generated network to that from a digitized network.</p>
Processing time requirements	<p>The time required to complete the full WAM analysis is considerable. Any increases in system capabilities will result in more efficient processing.</p>

The WAM User Guide contains more detail and discussion on many of these issues.

# 7. Literature Cited

- Bolstad, P.V. and T. Stowe. 1994. An evaluation of DEM accuracy: elevation, slope and aspect. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 60(11). pp. 11327-1332 *cited in Civco et al (1995)*.
- Civco, D.L., A.R. Garcia and G.S. Warner. 1995. Key steps to effective watershed characterization. *GIS World*, November 1995. pp. 62-67.
- Eash, D.A. 1994. A geographic information system procedure to quantify drainage-basin characteristics. *Water Resources Bulletin*. Vol. 30, No. 1. pp. 1-8.
- Forest Ecosystem Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT). 1994. A Federal Agency Guide for Pilot Watershed Analysis. Version 1.2. 186 pp.
- Hay, L.E. and L.K. Knapp. 1996. Integrating a geographic information system, a scientific visualization system, and a precipitation model. *Water Resources Bulletin*. Vol.32, No.2. pp.357-369.
- Hydroconsult EN3 Services Ltd. 1997. Hydrologic Operational Manual. Prepared for Foothills Model Forest, Hinton, AB. 10 pp. plus 19 figures.
- Klock, G.O. 1985. Modeling the cumulative effects of forest practices on downstream aquatic ecosystems. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. pp. 237-241.
- Lee, R. 1980. *Forest Hydrology*. Columbia University Press, New York. 349 pp.
- Loucks, D.P. 1995. Developing and implementing decision support systems: a critique and challenge. *Water Resources Bulletin*. Vol. 31, No. 4 pp. 571-582.
- Mackey, B.G.; McKenney, D.W.; Widdifield, C.A.; Sims, R.A.; Lawrence, K.; Szczyrek, N. 1994. A new digital elevation model of Ontario. *Nat. Resour. Can., Canadian Forest Service – Ontario, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.* NODA/NFP Tech. Rep. TR—6. 26 p. + App.
- Martz, L.W. and J. Garbrecht. 1993. Automated extraction of drainage network and watershed data from digital elevation models. *Water Resources Bulletin*. Vol. 29, No. 6. pp. 901-908.
- Montgomery, D.R., G.E. Grant and K. Sullivan. 1995. Watershed analysis as a framework for implementing ecosystem management. *Water Resources Bulletin*. Vol.31, No.3. pp. 369-386.
- Nip, A. M.-K. 1991. The Tri-Creeks Experimental Watershed - Changes in hydrology and water quality following forest harvesting and their impact on salmonid fishes in the Tri-Creeks Basin. Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, Forest Service. 66 pp.
- R.L. & L. Environmental Services Ltd. 1996. An information review of four native sportfish species in west-central Alberta. Prepared for Foothills Model Forest and the Fisheries Management and Enhancement Program. R.L.& L. Report No. 489F: 88 pp. and 2 app.
- Rothwell, R.L. 1978. *Watershed Management Guidelines for Logging and Road Construction in Alberta*. Northern Forest Research Centre, Edmonton, AB. Information Report NOR-X-208. 43 pp.
- Rothwell, R. and J. O'Neil. 1994. Proceedings of a workshop to develop a strategic plan for a watershed assessment model (WAM), January 10-12, 1994. Forest Technology School, Hinton, AB. Prepared for Foothills Model Forest. 35 pp. + 3 App.
- Schuett-Hames, D., A. Pleus, L. Bullchild and S. Hall. (eds.) 1994. *Timber-Fish-Wildlife Ambient Monitoring Manual*. Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympic, WA.
- Swanson. R.H. & Associates. 1997. *WRNSFMF User's Manual*. Using and applying the USEPA WRENSS hydrologic procedures for snow dominated regions "Rocky Mountains" and "Continental Maritime" applicable to the Foothills Model Forest, Hinton, Alberta, Canada. Version 1.2. 34 pp.
- Swanson, R.H. and G.R. Hillman. 1977. Predicted increased water yield after clear-cutting verified in west-central Alberta. Northern Forest Research Centre, Edmonton, AB. Information Report NOR-X-198. 40 pp.

The Forestry Corp. 1997a. Watershed Assessment Model GIS Application System Guide. Prepared for Foothills Model Forest, Hinton Alberta. September 1997.

The Forestry Corp 1997b. Watershed Assessment Model GIS Application User Guide. Prepared for Foothills Model Forest, Hinton Alberta. September 1997.

Tribe, A. 1991. Automated recognition of valley heads from digital elevation models. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 16(1). pp. 33-49. *cited in*. Martz and Garbrecht (1993).

Washington Forest Practices Board. 1994. Standard Methodology for Conducting Watershed Analysis. Board Manual Version 2.1.